

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Won-Joon Choi et al.

Application No.: 10/664,792

Art Unit.: 2611

Filing Date: 09/16/2003

Examiner: Cicely Q. Ware

For: "Spur Mitigation Techniques"

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: November 8, 2006

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL


1. Transmitted herewith is an amendment for this application.
2. **STATUS:** Applicant is other than a small entity.
3. **EXTENSION OF TERM:** The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.136 apply. Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition for extension of time.
4. **FEE FOR CLAIMS:** The fee for claims (37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)-(d)) has been calculated as shown below:

(Col.1)	(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)	LARGE ENTITY		
Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Addit. Fee	
Total 24	Minus 24	= 0	x \$50 =	\$0	
Indep. 11	Minus 11	= 0	x \$200 =	\$0	
First Presentation of Multiple Dependent Claim			+ \$360 =	\$0	
			Total		
			Addit. Fee	\$0	

No additional fee for claims is required.

5. **FEE DEFICIENCY:** If any additional extension and/or fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0574.

Customer No. 30547
Tel.: (408) 451-5907


SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Jeanette S. Harms
Reg. No. 35537

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Won-Joon Choi et al.

Assignee: Atheros Communications, Inc.

Title: Spur Mitigation Techniques

Serial No.: 10/664,792 File Date: September 16, 2003

Examiner: Cicely Q. Ware Art Unit: 2611

Docket No.: ATH-0133

Date: November 8, 2006

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO THE FIRST OFFICE ACTION

Initial Comments:

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. Figures 1-5 are objected to. The Specification is objected to because of an informality. Claims 2 and 3 have a duplicate claims warning. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for using "if, then" language. Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being rendered obvious by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

No claims are amended herein.